

Serial No. 09/863,513

- 6 -

50808aka

REMARKS

But for the minor modification to claim 7, the claims of this application are being resubmitted for reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-10 and 12-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Elliott (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0156779). Claim 11 stands rejected over Elliott in view of Stalcup ('743). However, it is Applicant's position that the Examiner has misinterpreted both Applicant's claims and the cited references.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner explains how the term "imagery" has been interpreted as "information of imagery." Apart from the fact that Applicant does not see a need for such an interpretation, it appears to be incorrect. Citing the same passage cited by the Examiner, "The TISC automatically detects and correlates events . . . or objects . . . that are observable in imagery and described in text reports." In other words, the invention does exactly what is stated in the specification; that is, images are compared to text. Applicant respectfully requests why the Examiner is changing this to "information of imagery." Images are images, though to a certain extent, "information" is used to manifest such images. Even with human eyes, scenes generate "information" in the mind of the viewer, but this appears to Applicant to be entirely irrelevant to the examination of this application.

With respect to the Elliott reference, comparison of textual material and imagery simply does not occur. Indeed, the Examiner appears to have misinterpreted this reference altogether. The Examiner claims that Elliott teaches "specifying a target concept," but this in and of itself appears to be untrue. Referencing paragraph [0026], it appears that a user of the Elliott system inputs "a reference location and a search radius about the reference location," and not a "target concept." With respect to "providing textual material and imagery," the Examiner cites paragraphs 25 and 26, but nowhere can Applicant find any reference to imagery in these portions. The same holds true of the step of training a discriminating feature detector to search for locations within the imagery relating to a target concept. In this regard, the Examiner states that "the imagery is considered to be the 'coordinate information' in Elliott." However, this appears to be entirely incorrect. Referring to the definition section of the Elliott application, paragraph [0019], "coordinate information" is defined as "alpha-numeric values from a mathematical system for identifying spatial locations, and can be arbitrary, geometric, virtual, and galactic." This is simply not "imagery." Indeed, by "spatial," Elliott refers to coordinate information

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CIKOWSKI, P.C., 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 617-6000

Serial No. 09/863,513

- 7 -

50808aku

and identifier information, such as a city name, country, state, area code, zip code, and so forth. This is simply information about location, and not imagery.

Given that anticipation requires the disclosure of each and every element of an invention as claimed, anticipation simply does not apply in this case. With respect to the combination of Elliott and Stalcup, the Examiner claims that it would have been obvious to combine these references "for the purpose of efficient storage of the data and efficient indexing and retrieval of multi-media data objects."

Applicant has no idea from where this conclusion has been drawn, but in any event, there is no teaching or suggestion from the *prior art* as to the proposed combination, and only speculation on the part of the Examiner, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant believes that all claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's below-signed representative with any questions at the telephone and facsimile numbers provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posa

Reg. No. 37,424

Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,
Anderson & Cikowski, PC

P.O. Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300 FAX (734) 913-6007

Dated: August 8, 2005